ADDENDUM J

Seward Park Vegetation Management Plan

Public Comment

SEWARD PARK VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

Seattle Parks & Recreation Urban Forest Restoration Program
Public Meeting – December 16, 2004

Summary of Public Comment

Park Character
Multiple uses in park should be preserved: wonderful dicotamy between developed & forested areas.

What are the Olmsted influences and constraints for Seward? *Discussed balancing shore views with habitat plantings for salmon, also that Olmsted plan wasn't implemented but showed essentially fully-forested peninsula w/ limited clearings. Importance as terminus of Park & Blvd system & acquisition for its remarkable, intact forest and unique views.*

Education & Stewardship
Re-volunteers: urge people to adopt one task and stick with it: this does make a dent and demonstrates positive action for others to emulate. Won't get it all done in our lifetimes but that's not a reason to give up trying.

IvyOUT program has removed 15 acres of ivy, freed 675 trees: need to MAINTAIN. Can't depend solely on volunteers – will lose ground.

Park is a teaching space; only southerly third usually used due to time constraints. VMP should support this important activity.

History
Errors in specifics taken from Sherwood's synopsis, which was inaccurate. Examples: no one is documented to have lived on peninsula and homesteaded.

Conjecture only that forest was "high-graded" in latter 19th C: contradicted by absence of physical evidence, i.e. stumps with springboard notching. However, WPA could have blasted & hauled them out during 30's as part of extensive clearing in forest, since major dynamite explosions were described at the time.

Vegetation
Grasses are invasives; by shore grass invites geese. Favor shrub buffer along shore to discourage them.

Rather than making meadow of non-native grasses, should recreate REAL NW meadow. Not easily done, especially without burning that maintained them historically.

Recent hydroseeding of Hatchery grounds using non-native rye & fescue spp was a really bad idea. These grasses are an enormous problem for infesting sites cleared of invasives.

Historically, understory of forest was cleared out and replaced with grass to encourage people to use forested areas more (introduced exotic grasses).

Need to have plan to monitor for NEW invaders, to gain early control before they spread & become a huge problem. (former WA Noxious Weed Board director)

Must plant to replace invasives when removed, to reduce other weedy spp opportunistic takeover.

Umlauff's and fire suppression notions of period were wrong in terms of forest mgmt, but realized only much later.

Garry Oak grove: encourage, restore understory, remove lawn beneath trees where possible.

Garry oaks @ Martha Washington Park are part of the same burn-sustained habitat remnant at Seward. Bring back camassia, Western buttercup, etc. – may need to cordon off areas to do this.

Garry oak grove is very nice; favor keeping variety of forest types, not all Douglas fir..

Perimeter path: mow less, plant edges more heavily since cars no longer use and need shoulder or sightlines. *Peggy Pullen: amenable to changing practices that don't make sense any more.*

Should determine clear distance on shore-side verge of paved path and maintain for it: not well-defined currently, notably some of recent shoreline plantings.

Problems with recent shoreline plantings that block user access & views and are weedy. What's the story and was there a public process? Object to doing more without. *These plantings are part of grant-funded salmon habitat restoration including shore edge natives for shade as well as substrate replacement near shore and some de-armoring. Projects were managed by planner Kevin Stoops.*

SEWARD PARK VEGETATION MANAGEMENT

Seattle Parks & Recreation Urban Forest Restoration Program

Draft Document – March, 2005

Summary of Public Comment and Response

During the 3 week Public comment period following the presentation of the Draft Seward Park Vegetation Management Plan, significant public comments were received through email, mail and telephone. Over 158 comments were received from 44 citizens. A list of the commentators and an annotated list of comments has been included with this summary.

The comments were sorted into eight categories with the following results:

1. GENERAL REMARKS

15 General Comments regarding the document, generally favorable
Response: *The overall document addressed a large number of issues across the Park. As these comments are not specific to any one element they can no be addressed specifically.*

2. HAZARD TREES

The largest number of comments received (83) were in reference to the hazard tree inventory and more specifically, the identification of hazard trees within the park's interior forest. Hazard Tree comments focused on nine (9) issues. Hazard tree issues are found in the Hazard Tree Appendix of the Final VMP.

5 Comments regarding use of budget for Hazard trees
Response: *There is no specific budget for hazard tree abatement in Seward Park. Total estimated cost is listed in appendix D, itemized estimated costs are listed in appendix H.*

26 General comments not supporting the Hazard tree designation of interior forest trees
Response: *Trees in the interior forest are not considered hazards as the target value is low, the trails are infrequently occupied. Interior trees are now designated as No Action.*

9 comments asking for more signage and public education regarding hazard trees.
Response: *Educational signage is under discussion with Parks design and local staff.*

11 comments regarding the methods of hazard tree identification
Response: *Protocols to identify potentially weak trees are standardizing across the country. Parks staff performing this type of assessment are experienced and well trained in these protocols.*

13 comments regarding the liability and probability issues surrounding hazard trees
Response: *Protocols to identify potentially weak trees are standardizing across the country. Parks staff performing this type of assessment are experienced and well trained in these protocols.*

6 comments regarding the clarity of the maps of the hazard trees
Response: *Maps have been created to help clarify all issues raised.*

9 comments regarding the process by which hazard trees would be managed
Response: *All hazard trees identified will follow standard hazard tree procedures which include: locate any potentially disturbed wildlife, assess ability to create snag tree, assess ability to abate hazard by pruning or other means, thoroughly assess trees potential for failure. Priority actions and management practices are listed in Appendix D.*

3 comments regarding the use of hazard trees in the overall restoration process
Response: *All trees removed will be used to the most ecologically sound manner possible.*

1 comment regarding specific wildlife uses of hazard trees.
Response: *Wildlife concerns are a paramount issue for Parks staff; see the hazard tree discussion in the appendix of the VMP.*

3. RESTORATION ACTIONS

33 Comments regarding specific aspects of the Restoration recommendations
Response: *All comments regarding recommended restoration practices, plant palettes and methodologies were evaluated against current practices and field tested science. Integration of pertinent comments is found in Chapters 5 and 6 of the VMP. Field practices were pulled out of the body of the Plan and placed in a separate Appendix. Recommendations are tied directly to the findings in the revised Chapter 6, which now combines the previous Chapters 5 and 7.*

4. ZONE 9

12 comments regarding the management of Zone 9
Response: *Management recommendations for Zone 9 have been edited to address these concerns. Management scope, objectives and priority actions can be found in Chapter 6 beginning on page 59. Management for mountain beaver caused disturbance of forest succession and restoration plantings has been placed in addendum N. A specific plant palette has been created for the area.*

5. VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PLANNING

6 comments regarding the Process, both public and internal, that Parks used to develop the VMP.
Response: *Standard Public information processes was utilized to develop the Draft VMP. To address citizens concerns an additional one week of comment period was added as well as an additional public meeting to present the final VMP.*

6. SIGNIFICANT TREES

4 comments regarding the Significant Tree survey
Response: *Improvements to the mapping have addressed these comments. Outstanding trees have been displayed on a separate map, numbering issues have been corrected both on the map and in the chart.*

7. WILDLIFE ISSUES

4 comments regarding specific Wildlife issues, primarily birds and endangered species
Response: *Endangered species protection is detailed in Sections XX regarding bald eagle protection. Management scope, objectives and priority actions are included in chapter 6, beginning on page 61.*

8. INVASIVE SPECIES

1 comment regarding the emphasis on Invasive species
Response: *Invasive species are not as large a threat in Seward Park as they are in other Parks. The VMP focuses on invasive removal as a preventive course of action assure the continuance of native species dominance within Seward Park.*

List of Commentators

LAST NAME	FIRST NAME	ORGANIZATION	E-MAIL	ZIP
Adkison	Melissa Reis		melissa@gencon.com	
Alverson	Ed	The Nature Conservancy	ealverson@TNC.org	
Berger	David		dab20@aol.com	
Castellanos	Candy	Audubon Washington	ccastellanos@audubon.org	
Curl	Hubert		hcurl55@comcast.net	
Dahn	Denise		dahndesign@aol.com	
DeCarlo	Barbie-Danielle		contrabarbie@yahoo.com	
Fischlin	Segue		segue@nzn.com	
Flatley	Terry	City of Renton Parks Div	Tflatley@ci.renton.wa.us	
Gianoulis	Tina		gianoulis@earthlink.com	
Hall	Bruce		bruchal@drizzle.com	
Hamilton	Cyd		crassulaceae@yahoo.com	
Herod	Donald		NumbFunk@aol.com	
Hinnendael	Anne		ahinnendael@earthlink.com	
Hovanic	Catherine E.	Wash. Native Plant Scty	wnps@wnps.org	
Johnson	Ben		Bjohnson@starbucks.com	
Keenan	JoAnn		keenanjam@comcast.net	
King	Ellen B.		ebking24@comcast.net	
Lambert	Gretchen		glambert@fullerton.edu	
Lee	Dick		dickinseattle@yahoo.com	
Lewis	Evelyn		friendsosp@hotmail.com	
Marsh	Mike		swamp@blarg.net	
Martin	Nannette		nannettem@earthlink.net	
Miller	Bonnie		Bmiller@serv.net	
Moty	Joyce		jmoty@nwlink.com	
Naess	Ralph		rnaess@comcast.net	
Newbold	Ed			98108
Patten	Laurie		lauriep@ccsww.org	
Patterson	Cheryl		vari@ix.netcom.com	
Porter	Tom			98118
Quirk	Michael J.		mjqtv@earthlink.net	
Rasmussen	Pat		patr@crcwnet.com	
Smith	Allan L.			98118
Smith	David		dlsmith@ix.netcom.com	
Strieck	Jeff		revjeff3@netzero.com	
Symington	Paul		psymingt@gonzaga.edu	
Talbert	Paul B.		ptalbert@fhcrc.org	
Vacca	Shelli		shellivacca@hotmail.com	
Venetti	Tifany		mjqtv@earthlink.net	
Westphal	David M.		dave.westphal1@juno.com	
Wheeler	Woody			98115
Williams	Collin			98118

Area	Detail	Comment
Comment		Seward Park needs to be preserved for all the kids who live in southeast Seattle who do not have the luxury of seeing old growth forests in the Cascades and Olympics.
Comment		I have reviewed the Seward Park Vegetation Management Plan and have some serious concerns that if implemented, it would cause irreparable harm.
Comment		Seward Park's remnant ancient forest is a precious legacy left in our care and we have a duty to protect it. We must certainly not ruin it.
Comment		…it appears that it will be a very valuable document..
Comment		The park system's own naturalists could have valuable input on both educational opportunities and ecology, and it is unfortunate that the Parks department has generally discouraged them from being advocates for their own parks.
Comment		The overall thrust and goals of the Seward Parks Vegetation Management Plan are commendable. [22]
Comment		Further, I strongly support the policies derived from previous park plans that are summarized on page 15. [22]
Comment		Seward Park is an outdoor classroom for park naturalists
Comment		Seward Park is a world-class park.
Comment		It is one of only 2 places in the city where people can go to see a remnant of old-growth forest: 400 year-old Doug firs, red cedars and big leaf maples…
Comment		…Seward Park, the jewel of the Seattle Park System…
Comment		It is a matter of discussion but it can be argued that off leash dogs have an impact on plant life in the park.
Comment		I just hope that the city "walks the talk", and acts as admirably as it may speak.
Comment		Nature is not "neat"; please do not make the Seward park forest all neat and tidy!
Comment		Concerns over aesthetics are trivial.
Hazard Tree	Budget	The money saved by not cutting the trees could be spent on: educational signage extolling the virtue of the magnificent forest and the significance of habitat; hiring a senior gardener for Seward Park to supervise the removal of invasives, restoration and maintenance of new plantings; hire crews like Earth Corps to augment the efforts of volunteers.
Hazard Tree	Budget	…the VMP makes no effort to define acceptable risk, describe cost-benefit ratios for various kinds of risk management, or to compare the risks tree-falling to other risks.
Hazard Tree	Budget	The plan also does not discuss what other safety measures might be more effective for the $90,000 recommended for hazard trees.
Hazard Tree	Budget	Hazard tree removal is the only funded part of the VMP.
Hazard Tree	Budget	The hazard tree removal proposal appears cost-ineffective.[18]
Hazard Tree	Comment	I have been unable to read the "Management Plan" anywhere and am concerned that removing these trees would diminish the integrity of this extraordinary area.
Hazard Tree	Comment	Removing trees from the forest, as proposed by the hazard tree plan, fails to protect the forest and is in direct conflict with the core agenda of the VMP.
Hazard Tree	Comment	The hazard tree plan seems contrary to the goals of forest preservation and environmental education, but does the plan make good sense for

		safety?
Hazard Tree	Comment	The public does not support the hazard tree plan as applied to the interior of the Magnificent Forest.
Hazard Tree	Comment	Removing tree from the forest fails to protect or improve the health of the forest [18]
Hazard Tree	Comment	It seems that 85 very large and old trees have been identified as possibly dangerous to life and structures.
Hazard Tree	Comment	The plan applies the "hazard" designation much too freely.
Hazard Tree	Comment	This is the part of the forest that is the least-occupied, yet the plan designates these areas as "frequently occupied" or "some occupation". This is untrue.
Hazard Tree	Comment	None of the trees in the park's interior should be listed as hazardous.
Hazard Tree	Comment	The chances of anyone being struck by one of those trees is astronomically small, since only a small number of people walk by and don't stop.
Hazard Tree	Comment	These trees are up to several hundred years old, among the very few such venerable giants left in Seattle, and as such are a precious and irreplaceable heritage.
Hazard Tree	Comment	While I agree that a some trees may present a hazard to the public, the danger is greatly overstated.
Hazard Tree	Comment	The trees […] (#s 32-44, 50-52, 56-66) should be LEFT ALONE.
Hazard Tree	Comment	It appears the consultant works in the timber industry and does not give much thought to issues of habitat and ecology
Hazard Tree	Comment	The issue of safety is puzzling since Seward Park is not a campground.
Hazard Tree	Comment	Please DO NOT play God in the forest and remove trees that you assess to be dangerous.
Hazard Tree	Comment	This park is the heart and core of my community. I am sad to hear that it is marked for destruction.
Hazard Tree	Comment	I was horrified and saddened to learn of the proposal to cut down many of Seward Parks beautiful old trees.
Hazard Tree	Comment	I was pleased with what I heard from Mark; he explained how he hates to make the decision to fell an entire old tree. He said he want to keep trees standing , and to cut when he determines that a tree is likely to fall in the near future
Hazard Tree	Comment	I've also heard from a number of citizens who are genuinely concerned about the potential for over zealous tree cutting and pruning in the park; I found their comments quite compelling as well.
Hazard Tree	Comment	Several years ago, I voted in favor of Pro-Parks. I thought that Parks Department would improve parks by removing invasives like ivy and clematis - true dangers. If I had known that this plan was to be a product of that vote, I would have voted no.
Hazard Tree	Comment	Removing the big trees just because they are in decline does not make forest management sense.
Hazard Tree	Comment	Trees fall in forests. This is inescapable. Rarely, do falling trees kill or injure people.
Hazard Tree	Comment	In my mind, the Parks Department sets an example of landscape practice for the public, and unfortunately a poor on in regard to trees. [21]
Hazard Tree	Comment	I can understand removing so called hazard trees along the outside of the park near the water.
Hazard Tree	Comment	It is reasonable to remove hazard tree #47

Hazard Tree	Education	Public education about hazards is last in the priority actions for hazard trees , but it ought to be first.
Hazard Tree	Education	Education could be just as effective - and much, much less expensive - than pruning and removal of hazard trees. [18]
Hazard Tree	Education	Hazard trees' are teaching opportunities since they are habitats for a community of fungi, insects, birds and small mammals.
Hazard Tree	Education	To address the safety issue, post a sign that speaks to the danger of a forest.
Hazard Tree	Education	To protect public safety, the Parks department should develop signage that informs people of the danger when there are high winds.
Hazard Tree	Education	[for hazard trees] posting a statement on park signs, the website, brochures and etc. that Parks department is not liable for acts of nature (God) in parks should be sufficient. [22]
Hazard Tree	Education	If the city is concerned about liability, why not install signs saying you walk through the interior of the park at your own risk?
Hazard Tree	Education	I also propose that you make this more public so more people would be aware of what you intend to do rather than trying to just sneak this initiative past.
Hazard Tree	Education	…educating the public on the hazards of a mature forest, particularly during high winds, might be far more effective for public safety than removing suspect trees.
Hazard Tree	Identification	We owe it to ourselves and to our children and grandchildren to protect and preserve these trees as long as possible.
Hazard Tree	Identification	Some of these old trees may live another century or more before they fall.
Hazard Tree	Identification	The designated Doug Firs show no sign of danger to the public.
Hazard Tree	Identification	As an ecologist, I am also disturbed by the characterization of ancient Douglas-firs as "fire-damaged and diseased"
Hazard Tree	Identification	A few exploratory woodpecker holes I the surface of the Douglas-fir does not make it "diseased," nor does it make it hazardous.
Hazard Tree	Identification	Prediction of which trees will fall is difficult at best, as indicated the recent fall of a tree that was not on the hazard list across a trail that had been recently surveyed for hazards.
Hazard Tree	Identification	...I frequently use the old trees with burn scars, including some of those on the hazard tree list, to teach park visitors about forest fires, forest succession, and the age of the forest.
Hazard Tree	Identification	…the snag that has been leaning over the ridge trail for decades (tree #39) are loved and used as landmarks by park users.
Hazard Tree	Identification	Lastly, if the tree crews need trees to cut, there are plenty of trees that need to be culled in situations where Big leaf maples were topped for many years creating giant hedges of weak and crowded saplings… It isn't as sexy as taking down an old growth tree but it would contribute to a healthier urban forest in the long run
Hazard Tree	Identification	I often make use of Rogers Park on the north slope of Queen Anne Hill; I am genuinely pleased at how the city has managed those trees, leaving dead snags standing for the benefit of wildlife. I hope the city can do as well in Seward Park.
Hazard Tree	Identification	The resistograph involves boring into the tree, which increases the chance of introducing fungi and insects, potentially causing the kind of damage that will be used as evidence in favor of removing the trees.
Hazard Tree	Liability	Information on the number of people hurt by trees in Seward Park or even in all of the park system is so not offered in the VMP

Hazard Tree	Liability	Since (according to the Parks department own study) 90% of users do not go in to the Forest, and the use in the Forest is transitory in nature (walking and running) the risk is greatly reduced.
Hazard Tree	Liability	The VMP's hazard tree assessment does not demonstrate that the program is necessary to protect public safety. [18]
Hazard Tree	Liability	It is unlikely that people would visit the park during a windstorm that could blow a tree down.
Hazard Tree	Liability	Two professionals, not connected with the park) [Point Defiance, Tacoma] spent considerable time hiking all the trails on two separate days (not together) The conclusions were almost identical. They said there is NO WAY to predict what will fall in the forest. ...snags, when they go down, will probably do it in a peaceful quiet weather day. [27]
Hazard Tree	Liability	With the exception of possible removal of some trees in a high use area such as the children's play area; trees in the forest should be left alone.
Hazard Tree	Liability	Any tree that is next to a seldom - used trail should be left alone.
Hazard Tree	Liability	Only trees that area near "targets", such as a picnic area, bathroom, play area, parking area, where people actually occupy, not just pass through, the tree's space, should be considered for possible hazard designations.
Hazard Tree	Liability	It is impossible to protect everyone from everything. Any tree, anywhere can fall at anytime.
Hazard Tree	Liability	In any case, a 1/1000 chance does not qualify as "a high probability of striking people". [19]
Hazard Tree	Liability	There is no evidence that any person has ever been injured by anything falling in the Seward Park forest in its 94-year history.
Hazard Tree	Liability	The plan reportedly uses risk standards developed fro campgrounds, but Seward Park differs notably from a campground…
Hazard Tree	Liability	…most park users would support monitoring of trees around playground and picnic shelters, and reduction or removal of threatening trees if absolutely necessary
Hazard Tree	Mapping	The positions on the map [for significant trees] are not integrated with the positions for hazard trees.
Hazard Tree	Mapping	The [hazard tree] map is inaccurate, and difficult to use.
Hazard Tree	Mapping	Mostly they are located in areas well off the beaten path - on small, social trails, or in the deep interior of the park, where less than 10% of the visitors go.
Hazard Tree	Mapping	Several of the trees that have been earmarked for removal or assessment do not correlate to their location on the map.
Hazard Tree	Mapping	In addition, the "tags" on the trees are hidden from view. This appears to be an attempt to hide from public scrutiny the trees that will be removed.
Hazard Tree	Mapping	I could not locate tree #48 […] I suspect the species of this tree is misidentified (as is tree #72).
Hazard Tree	Process	As the current draft reads, these groups [Park naturalists, Washington Native Plant Society, Seattle Audubon, and Friends of Seward Park] are listed as useful only in the implementation of the plan AFTER the trees are cut.
Hazard Tree	Process	There has been no public input even raising the issue of hazard trees at Seward Park, much less asking for their removal. [18]
Hazard Tree	Process	…the plan would benefit from a much greater emphasis on educational opportunities,…
Hazard Tree	Process	For trees #46, and #53 (erroneously listed as dead) pruning would reduce risk without destroying as much habitat.

Hazard Tree	Process	Unfortunately, the trees that have already been 'snagged' have been done in such an artless manner rendering them virtually useless for habitat.
Hazard Tree	Process	If one falls on its own, it can then be allowed to lie where it falls and slowly rot, providing food and shelter to young trees, other vegetation and small animals.
Hazard Tree	Process	Please use every avenue to save these trees.
Hazard Tree	Process	...pruning of dead limbs that overhang the perimeter trail. …as long as it is confined to the dead branches;...
Hazard Tree	Process	SPR [should make] good on the promise in the VMP to provide advance notice of removal or reduction if [the madrona on the hazard list] status changes.
Hazard Tree	Restoration	Tree removal constitutes the kind of disturbance that invites nonnative invasives to come in and take hold (VMP, p. 47) [18]
Hazard Tree	Restoration	…no forest ecologist was hired to assess the value of the same trees in the ecosystem or the impact of removing them on other plants and wildlife.
Hazard Tree	Restoration	I urge you to stop this unnecessary and thoughtless action which will remove trees that have been growing for centuries, damage the ecological integrity of this irreplaceable resource, without measurably improving public safety.
Hazard Tree	Wildlife	Wildlife in a mature forest needs dead, decaying , and diseased trees. [18]
Invasives		St. John's Wort could be removed from the Garry Oak groves and natives planted.
Process		Plan lacks the balance of diverse perspectives
Process		The present VMP is poorly advertised and difficult to access.
Process		The sign for the VMP at Seward Park has not been updated to even let citizens know where to access the VMP and when comments are due, and updates put by citizens have been removed.
Process		As the VMP is implemented, the Parks department should continue to seek input from the public,…
Process		[the plan would benefit from]… input of ecologists and wildlife biologists.
Process		Park naturalists, Washington Native Plant Society, Seattle Audubon, and Friends of Seward Park should be consulted BEFORE any trees are removed.
Restoration		Restoration should not be left to volunteers
Restoration		The VMP has many great features, most notably its focus on removing invasive plants from Seattle's largest and best mature/ old-growth forest, and on restoring parts of the forest that are compromised or fragmented.
Restoration		The Magnificent Forest is the oldest and best forest we have in Seattle, and deserves the best protection we can give it. It is therefore laudable that the VMP aims to provide that protection.
Restoration		Al also showed mea natural opening in the I\middle of this mature forest, with surface water through much of it and hydric soils, nicely vegetated with ferns, salmonberry, spirea and red osier dogwood, which the Plan says we will spend many dollars to "revegetate".
Restoration		It would be good if there were a comprehensive list of the plants in Seward Park, especially the native plants.
Restoration		I also concur with most of the "Priority Implementation Initiatives" - especially the following: Ivy off trees, holly eradication, Garry oak/ madrona regeneration and protection, block social trails, meadow

		conversion [22]
Restoration		In 2000, when Audubon and Parks first started exploring the renovation of the Annex Building as the site for our flagship Audubon Center, Audubon completed a twenty-question site evaluation of Seward Park. The top five criteria included: Diversity of natural features, Proximity to underserved population, Proximity to similar facilities, "Wow!" factor of the site [17]
Restoration		...[the proceeding comment will be important] when a VMP is developed for the shoreline,...
Restoration		There are Norway maples, horse chest nuts, and white poplars growing in Seward Park and even those in the most ornamental of settings must be considered for removal…
Restoration		There are two thickets of laurel growing near the amphitheater which have subsequently infested the woods..
Restoration		Reforest more grassy areas (eg. Across from picnic shelter #3)
Restoration		Need a more representative plant palette for zone 12.
Restoration		I'm thinking of the possibility that duff could be trucked in from forests being bulldozed and seeing how many of the wildflower and other biodiversity we can bring back with it. [30]
Restoration		Every time I think about another plant species that should be re-established at Seward I have a tough time finding a spot that would look right for it. [30]
Restoration		I see that the plan addresses Garry Oak and Madrona habitat re-establishment in element 7.13 (p. 99) for Zone #39 of the park. It mentions that shrub and ground cover plants "typical for natural native oak range" would be planted and provides a species list in Chapter 8 (p. 104) as well as additional information in Appendix K). This is a great start! There are a number of other understory species that would be appropriate and valuable to restore as well. [29]
Restoration		I would also suggest that the species selected for revegetation in these areas be "Garry Oak ecosystem associated species native to Western Washington". For example, not all plants associated with the broader range of the Garry Oak distribution (noted in Approx. K) would be appropriate to plant/seed in this western Washington site. [29]
Restoration		Working to ensure that the source of plant materials is from appropriate genetic stock (varies for different plants) will also be important. As a member of the WNPS, I (and others) would be happy to provide support/ technical assistance on these aspects of the re-vege. plan. [29]
Restoration		The planning process should also include field surveys for each potential species, performed at the optimal season of the year to fine such species in flower or fruit. [20]
Restoration		The draft VMP places a significant emphasis on invasive plant species, but in my opinion there is a need for objective prioritization of target species and management actions. [20]
Restoration		I would suspect that with a complete botanical inventory, additional non-native species that are present but not yet abundant would be identified and early; management treatments could be taken to eliminate them as a threat. [20]

Restoration		I would suggest that the VMP include, as a proposed action, completion of the Seward Park plant list, and then utilize the "Handbook for Ranking Exotic Plants for Control" protocol to assess management priority for each non-native species that is documented to be present. [20]
Restoration		The VMP recognizes that native oak stands are rare in the Seattle area, but to me the VMP misses an opportunity to develop a vision for conservation and restoration of this site that would be of great value to the Seattle community. [20]
Restoration		The native oak stand in Seward Park provides an excellent opportunity (and in my mind, the best opportunity in the Seattle area) to bring together these natural and cultural legacies to restore a functioning example of this historically significant habitat. [20]
Restoration		In regard to developing a restoration planting list, it appears to me that additional inventory work is needed to determine if any native grasses or forbs associated with prairies and savannas still survive at the site [20]
Restoration		The meadow in zone 7, though dominated by exotic grasses, would be an excellent location for restoring native prairie, and oaks could be planted around the edge of the meadow. [20]
Restoration		Along the same lines, the "Restoration Plant List" contained in the appendices, could benefit from some revision, both to delete species that did not historically occur in the Seattle area, and to add further species that may have been important in the past but are not now well know. For example, Gymnocarpium dryopteris, cornus canadensis and clintonia uniflora don't seem particularly appropriate for forests in Seattle; they are species of montane forests. Viburnum ellipticum and Vancouveria hexandra do not occur naturally north of Pierce Cy.. While C.douglasii does occur in places in the Puget Sound region, C. suksdorfii is much more common and should be a priority for restoration plantings. [20]
Restoration		I would personally start with moss… if you can salvage large sheets of it, its amazing the hitchhikers you can get coming in with them- not just seedling wildflower and groundcovers, but things like saleganellas, club mosses of various kinds, and of course if you are careful to get a bit of the substrate, lots of soil micro flora and fauna that are probably almost as important as the visible stuff. [31]
Restoration		I do however; support your work on removing Ivy and Holly from the park.
Restoration		There is nothing wrong with monitoring [the madronas marked for inspection on the south side of the park],…
Restoration		They should also have competent biologists on hand to oversee implementation of projects to avoid such disasters as eliminating one of the last stands of hard-stem bulrush during salmon habitat restoration and re-seeding the hatchery with non-native grasses with invasive potential.
Restoration		Fallen or felled trees as well as fallen limbs should be left in-situ to replenish the soil with organic matter.
Restoration		A large portion of the funds would be better spent on removing invasive species, and not just English ivy.
Restoration		The hatchery site should have had a vegetation management plan before work was started on the hatchery.

Significant Tree		[The significant tree list] in the VMP, [isn't useful] … the numbers in the list do not correspond to the numbers on the map in Addendum M.
Significant Tree		First, at least one species of tree on the list, Sorbus aucuparia, European Mountain Ash, (11 on list, 14 on map) is invasive in the park.
Significant Tree		Second, it is ironic that all of our old-growth trees are not considered "significant" since they belong to a vanishing group.
Significant Tree		Third, some of the significant plants in Seward Park are not trees, so perhaps there should be a Significant Plant list.
Wildlife		Suggest introducing skunks to the park to manage the mountain beaver
Wildlife		Why hasn't a comprehensive wildlife survey been completed, and how can the goals to "enhance habitat for native wildlife and endangered species" (pg11) be implemented when all of the species are not known? [21]
Wildlife		Perhaps I missed it, but I didn't see any mention in the Draft Vegetation Management Plan, any mention of sensitive, threatened, or endangered species. [20]
Wildlife		I would suggest the VMP also identify native species population that are significant at the local level, but not necessarily rare on the state-wide basis. Some of these species have been identified in TNC's Willamette Valley-Puget Trough-Georgia Basin eco-regional assessment (see http://conserveonline.org/2004/06/g/WPG_Ecoregional_Assessment), and others may be documented in Art Jacobson's book. [20]
Zone 9 Management		Until recently, this area was heavily infested with Himalayan blackberries.
Zone 9 Management		I think the truth is that we don't know why this area has less tree cover.
Zone 9 Management		It may just be too wet for trees to establish.
Zone 9 Management		Two mountain beaver dens around logs on the main ridge trail show no obvious evidence of damage to the understory (mainly salal) or trees (mostly mature), calling into question the notion that mountain beavers have a significant impact in this forest.
Zone 9 Management		[A better] course of action is to continue to remove invasives and to monitor and study the area to see how natural revegetation proceeds after invasive removal,…
Zone 9 Management		The bare patches near the trail might benefit from planting moderately mature shrubs if they do not fill in over the next few years.
Zone 9 Management		Salmonberry and twinberry … might be a reasonable choice if something is needed to fill in this area.
Zone 9 Management		Monitoring and invasive removal are the most appropriate immediate actions for zone 9.
Zone 9 Management		The following plants are not listed on the plant palette for zone9 - Lonicera involucrata, Ribes divaricatum, mimulous moschatus, geranium carolinum, glyceria elata (regenerating profusely & suppressing blackberry seedlings)
Zone 9 Management		In zone 9 - lots of: Lonicera involucrata, Cornus stolonifera, Sprirea douglasii, Rubus spectabilis, Rosa nutkana
Zone 9 Management		In zone 9 - less of the following: Ribes divaricatum, Amelanchier alnifolia, Oemleria cerasiformis, Sambucus racemosa, Rhamnus purshiana, Rubus ursinus

Zone 9 Management		In zone 9 - other plants present: Claytonia siberica, Tolmiea menziesii, Fragaria vesca, Geum macrophylum, Epilobium angustifolium, Epilobium ciliatum, Stachys coolyae, Mimulus moscatus, Urtica dilica (dioica?), Geranium carolinum, Polystichum munitum, Pteridium aquilinum, Athyrim filix-femina, Equisetum arvense, juncus effuses, carex dewyana, glyceria elata

•••